

COMMONWEALTH BUREAU OF
PARASITOLOGY (HEALTH SERVICE),
WINDHES FARM,
505, HATFIELD ROAD,
ST. ALBANS, HERTS

VOLUME 10. Part 12
Pp. 355—390.

23rd July, 1953

29.8.53.

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of
THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON
ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS :

Copenhagen Discussions : Cases 34—38 Proposals relating to Article 25
(Cases 34—37) and Article 28 (Case 38)

LONDON:

Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publications Office
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

1953

Price Fourteen Shillings
(All rights reserved)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)

President : Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)

Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom)

B. The Members of the Commission

(Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology)

Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944)

Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) (1st January 1944)

Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (*President*) (28th March 1944)

Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)

Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) (1st January 1947)

Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)

Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) (1st January 1947)

Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (Argentina) (27th July 1948)

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948)

Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) (27th July 1948)

Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) (27th July 1948)

Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) (17th April 1950)

Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) (9th June 1950)

Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (United Kingdom) (9th June 1950)

Professor Tadeusz Jacewski (Poland) (15th June 1950)

Professor Robert Mertens (Germany) (5th July 1950)

Professor Erich Martin Hering (Germany) (5th July 1950)

C. The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

Honorary Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary : Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming

Honorary Archivist : Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Chairman : The Right Hon. Walter Elliot, C.H., M.C., F.R.S., M.P.

Honorary Secretary and Managing Director : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Publications Officer : Mrs. C. Rosner

E. The Addresses of the Commission and the Trust

Secretariat of the Commission : 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1

Offices of the Trust : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 10, Part 12 (pp. 355-390)

23rd July, 1953

CASE No. 34

ARTICLE 25 : PROPOSED INSERTION OF A PROVISION THAT A TRIVIAL NAME CONSISTING OF SPELLED-OUT LETTERS OR NUMERALS SHALL NOT BE ACCEPTED AS AVAILABLE WHEN THOSE LETTERS OR NUMERALS WERE ORIGINALLY EMPLOYED AS ORDINALS FOR THE ENUMERATION OF THE SPECIES, SUBSPECIES OR INFRA-SUBSPECIFIC NAMES CONCERNED

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)371)

DOCUMENT 34/1

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

ON MR. G. H. E. HOPKINS' PROPOSAL RELATING TO TRIVIAL NAMES CONSISTING OF SPELLED-OUT LETTERS AND NUMERALS

Attention is drawn to the proposal submitted by Mr. G. H. E. Hopkins (*British Museum (Natural History), The Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts.*) on the subject of the status of trivial names consisting of spelled-out letters or numerals in cases where those letters or numerals were originally employed for the enumeration of the species, subspecies or infra-subspecific forms concerned in lists in catalogues or the like.

2. Mr. Hopkins' application was published in September, 1951 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 52-53), and it is accordingly necessary here to refer to it only in sufficient detail to enable a decision to be taken on it. The point is this : Serial letters were rejected as trivial names in the Commission's *Opinion* 64 and this decision was confirmed in 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 140). But this decision does not cover the further case, on which a decision is now asked where :—

- (1) An author "A" gives descriptions for a number of races or forms but does not give names to them, contenting himself with applying to them either serial letters ("a", "b", etc.) or serial numbers.

- (2) A later author makes the mistake of supposing that the serial letters used by author "A" were intended by him to be names; in order to get round the difficulty that an individual letter is not eligible to be a trivial name, the later author then spells out the letter, thereby creating a word which he treats as having been published by author "A" as a name.

3. Mr. Hopkins gives an example where an author (Piaget) described a number of forms for a given species and applied to these forms, which he did not name, serial letters in the Greek alphabet, and a later author (Kellogg) spelled out these letters—as "alpha", etc.—and treated them as names given by the earlier author. Mr. Hopkins adds that the names so given by Kellogg have been ignored by most authors, but that recently one author has started to use them. It is for this reason that Mr. Hopkins asks for an immediate decision.

4. The suggestion made by Mr. Hopkins is that a provision should be added to the *Règles* that letters and numerals are ineligible for use as trivial names and that this applies equally where letters or numerals were originally applied to the taxonomic unit concerned as ordinals and where some later author spells out those letters or transliterates those figures.

5. A solution on the lines recommended by Mr. Hopkins would certainly meet the difficulty he has raised. It seems to me, however, that it would be going too far to place an absolute ban upon the use of such words as "alpha", "delta" or "quatuor" as trivial names (however inappropriate they may be) if they were deliberately published as such, for names so published stand in a different position from that of the same names—as it were—accidentally published, as were names of this kind by Kellogg in the example cited by Mr. Hopkins. If this view were to be taken, it might be considered that the needs of the case would be sufficiently met if a provision were to be inserted in Article 25 prescribing that, where an author spells out a letter or transliterates a numeral applied by a former author as an ordinal to an unnamed species, race or form and attributes that name to the author by whom the letter or numeral had been used as an ordinal and not as a name, the name, as published by the later author, shall have no status of availability. Under such a ruling, the word "alpha" (to take an example) would not constitute an available trivial name when (as in the case cited by Mr. Hopkins) it was published, as it were, accidentally and without an intention to publish a new name on the part of the author who first published the word "alpha" as a name, i.e., where the author concerned had no "*animus nominandi*" (see Document 32/1). On the other hand, the word "alpha" would be acceptable as a trivial name, if deliberately published as such by any later author.

CASE No. 35

ARTICLE 25 : PROPOSED INSERTION OF A PROVISION DENYING THE STATUS OF AVAILABILITY TO A TRIVIAL NAME INADVERTENTLY PUBLISHED AS THE RESULT OF THE MISREADING OF A PREVIOUS PUBLICATION OR OF A MUSEUM LABEL OR THE LIKE

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)577)

DOCUMENT 35/1

By the late JAMES L. PETERS (*Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard College, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.*)

Letter dated 11th June, 1951

Mr. H. G. Deignan, of the United States National Museum, has called to my attention a singular case which I believe should be submitted to the International Commission for an *Opinion*.

The facts, supplied by Mr. Deignan, are as follows. In 1869 the United States National Museum acquired a collection of birds including a specimen of Horned Lark (*Eremophila alpestris* (Linn.)) from the dealer Wilhelm Schlüter of Halle an der Saale. This bird bears an original label with the words "Alauda alpestris/var: bei Astrakan". From the file of correspondence with Schlüter it is clear that Astrakan represents the province of that name in south-eastern Russia.

Ridgway, in Baird, Brewer and Ridgway, *History of North American Birds, Land Birds*, vol. 2 [Feb. 1874], p. 141, writes under the account of *Eremophila alpestris* "... there is also a fine specimen from Astrachan representing a white-throated race ('var *bei* on MS. label')", and the name "*bei*" is again mentioned on page 142 in connection with a comparison with *E.a. occidentalis*. A further complication is that the name *bei* antedates *Otocorys brandti* Dresser, *History Birds of Europe*, pt. 32, Dec. 1874, a name applicable to the same race of Horned Lark, and one that has been in continuous use since its introduction.

Of course no confusion would ensue were *bei* to replace *brandti*—merely a little temporary inconvenience and the usual resentment. The crux of the matter in my mind is the nature of the name. The German word "*bei*" is a preposition meaning about; at; near, etc., and prepositions are not acceptable as trivial names under the Rules (Articles 14, 15 and 16, *Opinion* 64). It may

be argued that Ridgway (who was in his early twenties at the time) was unaware of the meaning of the word "bei" and imagined it to be a manuscript name, noun or adjective, in a European tongue. It may also be argued that "bei" can be taken as an arbitrary combination of letters or "barbarous" word and as such would be available under the rules.

On the other hand, suppose some German author with a specimen of an American bird from near Washington had named it "near".

My feeling in the matter is that the name "bei" be set aside as not being acceptable as a trivial name under the Rules, and that the Commission make clear that this, and only this, is the reason for its action. To set "bei" aside under suspension of the rules would not accomplish any useful purpose.

DOCUMENT 35/2

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

PROPOSED DENIAL OF AVAILABILITY FOR TRIVIAL NAMES INADVERTENTLY PUBLISHED THROUGH THE MISREADING OF A WORD WRITTEN ON A LABEL OR USED IN A BOOK

In his letter of 11th June, 1951 (see Document 35/1) the late Dr. James L. Peters drew attention to a case where an American ornithologist misread a label bearing the legend "*Alauda alpestris*/var : bei Astrakan" on a specimen of the Horned Lark obtained by the U.S. National Museum from the German dealer Schlüter, mistakenly supposing that the German preposition "bei" was a manuscript trivial name applied (by Schlüter or some other German ornithologist). Dr. Peters further pointed out that the foregoing mistake was made public in a paper published in February, 1874, and therefore that, if the word "bei" were accepted as having been validly (though inadvertently) published by Ridgway on the above date, the oldest available name for this white-throated subspecies of *Eremophila alpestris* (Linnaeus) would be *bei*, that subspecies not having been deliberately named until December, 1874, when Dresser gave it the trivial name *brandti*.

2. Dr. Peters pointed out that no confusion would arise if the trivial name of this bird were to be changed from *brandti*, the name by which (he explained) it has been continuously known since 1874, to the name *bei*, and he therefore did not favour the use by the Commission of its plenary powers to

protect the name *brandti* as against the alleged name *bei*. He felt however, that a word of the kind represented by the word "bei" ought not to be accepted as having been validly published under the *Règles*. Dr. Peters pointed out also that a name of this kind would be particularly objectionable to workers belonging to the country from whose national language the misconceived trivial name was drawn. What, he asked, would American ornithologists think if a German author, making a mistake similar to that made by Ridgway in 1874, was to give the trivial name "near" to an American bird taken "near" Washington? He might well have added that, if availability, as a trivial name, were to be granted to a German preposition (such as "bei") inadvertently published as such a name, there would be nothing to prevent the appearance, as trivial names, of other German prepositions such as "am", French prepositions such as "près", "sur", etc., and English prepositions such as "at", "on", "in", etc. Clearly, names of this sort would be a reproach to zoological nomenclature.

3. Recommendation submitted : Dr. Peters' suggestion was that alleged names of this kind should be ruled as unavailable by the International Commission under an interpretative "Declaration". Such a "Declaration" would, however, need to be brought before the next International Congress of Zoology, and, as a Congress is to meet at Copenhagen in 1953, it seems to me that the best course would be to put this matter before the Commission at its Session during the Congress, so that it may make to the Congress whatever proposal it considers the most appropriate. The proposal which, following the line suggested by Dr. Peters, I should like to submit for consideration is that there should be inserted in the *Règles* a provision "that, where, by reason of misreading a book or paper or of a museum label or the like, an author erroneously concludes that a given word employed by the previous author had been intended by him to be the trivial name for the taxonomic unit concerned and himself adopts that word to be the trivial name for that taxonomic unit, the name so published shall possess no availability under the Law of Priority".

CASE No. 36

ARTICLE 25 : PROPOSED INSERTION OF A PROVISION THAT CERTAIN CLASSES OF GENERIC NAMES PUBLISHED FOR FOSSIL SPECIES AND BEARING THE TERMINATION “-ITES”, “-YTES”, OR “-ITHES” POSSESS NO STATUS IN ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

(Commission's references Z.N.(S.)415 and 447)

DOCUMENT 36/1

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

PROPOSALS FOR THE CO-ORDINATION OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY DR. L. R. COX FOR THE REJECTION OF CERTAIN CLASSES OF GENERIC NAMES PUBLISHED FOR FOSSIL SPECIES AND BEARING THE TERMINATION “-ITES”, “-YTES” OR “-ITHES” WITH A PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY PROFESSOR J. WANNER FOR THE AUTOMATIC EMENDATION FROM “-CRINITES” TO “-CRINUS” OF THE TERMINATIONS OF GENERIC NAMES PUBLISHED FOR SPECIES OF PELMATOZOA

The object of the present note is to draw attention to the overlap between a proposal (Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)447) submitted by Professor J. Wanner (*Scheidegg/Allgäu, Bavaria, Germany*) for the automatic emendation from “-crinites” to “-crinus” of the terminations of certain generic names published for species of *Pelmatozoa* with a slightly earlier proposal for the rejection of certain classes of generic names published for fossil species and bearing the terminations “-ites”, “-ytes” or “-ithes” submitted by Dr. L. R. Cox (*British Museum (Natural History)*) (application Z.N.(S.)415). I have discussed this question with Dr. Cox and with Professor Raymond C. Moore and have corresponded about it with Professor Wanner. At the end of the present note I submit, in agreement with Dr. Cox, a suggestion which both meets the objects which he has in view and at the same time provides the relief in regard to names for *Pelmatozoa* published with the termination “-crinites” sought by Professor Wanner and his colleagues.

(1) Dr. L. R. Cox's general proposal relating to generic names having the terminations "-ites", "-ytes" and "-ithes"

2. Dr. Cox's application for the rejection of certain classes of generic names published for genera of fossil species and bearing the terminations "-ites", "-ytes" or "-ithes" is annexed as Document 36/2. This proposal is confined to those generic names of the foregoing general class which are based upon the names of genera previously established either for living or fossil species. Dr. Cox has deliberately excluded from his application generic names bearing the foregoing terminations where the name in question was published only for living species, since such names fall outside the field now under consideration. He has excluded also names published with the foregoing terminations for genera of fossils in cases where the generic name in question is not derivative from the name of a previously established genus. This second exclusion will leave as available names a certain number of early names which have never come into general use. Dr. Cox recognises that the continued availability of such names constitutes a threat to stability, for at any time any of these names might be substituted by some author for well-established names. In a letter (dated 7th April, 1949) on this subject, Dr. Cox wrote: "It will probably be best to draw up a list of '-ites' names not covered by this application which it is desirable to suppress and to submit the whole list to be dealt with under the plenary powers". In further correspondence Dr. Cox explained that the preparation of the list which he had undertaken to compile would be "rather a formidable task and involve research in quite a number of early works, even so far as the Mollusca are concerned". He suggested also that for other groups help should be sought from palaeontologists who were specialists in those groups (letter of 25th October, 1949). For various reasons the required lists are not at present available. In view of the impending meetings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and of the International Congress of Zoology, it has been considered that the best course is to submit the general problem for consideration at those meetings.

(2) Professor J. Wanner's proposal relating to the emendation to "crinus" of the termination "-crinites" in the case of generic names published for species of Pelmatozoa

3. Early in 1950 an application was received, through Dr. Henning Lemche (Copenhagen), from Professor J. Wanner on the subject of the special case presented by generic names published for species of Pelmatozoa originally published with the termination "-crinites". This proposal (in an English translation kindly prepared by Dr. Lemche) is annexed hereto as Document 36/3. Dr. Wanner's suggestion was that names belonging to the foregoing class should be retained but that these names should be deemed to have been published with the termination "-crinus", to which many of them were (irregularly) emended by Agassiz (1835), whose action was widely followed by later workers.

This application is here reproduced as Document 36/3. This application was supported at the time of its receipt by statements furnished respectively by the late Dr. Th. Mortensen (*Universitetets Zoologisk Museum, Copenhagen*) and Professor Torsten Gislén (*Lunds Universitets Zoologiska Institution, Lund, Sweden*). These notes are annexed as Documents 36/4 and 36/5. At a later date Professor Raymond C. Moore (*University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.*) indicated his sympathy with the objects entertained by Professor Wanner but expressed a preference for proceeding by way of validating the use of the “-crinus” termination for a specified number of generic names of Crinoids; he mentioned eighty as the number possibly involved (Document 36/6). On receipt of this suggestion Professor Moore was asked to furnish the list which he had suggested. This he agreed to do, but pressure of other work subsequently prevented the accomplishment of this task.

4. In so far as the generic names originally published with the termination “-crinites” which Professor Wanner and his colleagues desire to retain with the emended termination “-crinus” are not derivatives of names previously applied to genera established for living species, the application applied to genera established for living species, the application (Z.N.(S.)447) received from Professor Wanner is entirely distinct from the earlier application (Z.N.(S.)415) submitted by Dr. Cox. When, however, we come to those names with “-ites” terminations which are derivatives of names previously applied to genera established either for living or fossil species, the two applications are identical, since under each those names would be preserved with the emended termination “-crinus” (in place of “-crinites”), the older version being deprived of rights under the Law of Priority.

(3) A combined proposal

5. In the light of the considerations explained above, the following proposal combining the application submitted by Dr. Cox with the special proposal in regard to Crinoid names submitted by Professor Wanner and his colleagues is submitted for consideration by the International Commission:—

Proposals relating to names published for genera of fossils with the termination-“-ites”

- (1) Where a fossil species has been described, figured, or referred to, under a generic name based upon the name of a genus previously established either for living or fossil species and (a) that name has for this purpose been modified by the addition to, or by the substitution for, the original termination, of the termination “-ites”, “-ytes” or “-ithes”, sometimes preceded by an additional consonant, and (b) there is no clear evidence that there was any intention on the part of the author

concerned that the name in question should designate a distinct generic group, the term so used shall, subject to the provisions of (3) below (relating to names published with the termination “-crinites”), possess no status under the Law of Priority but shall retain its rights under the Law of Homonymy.

- (2) No generic name currently in use is to be rejected in favour of a name published with any of the terminations specified in (1) (a) above but not derived from a name given to a genus of living species which at the date of the adoption of the provision specified in (1) above was not in general use, until, on an application being submitted to it, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature shall so direct.
- (3) Where a generic name that is not an emendation of a previously published name ending in “-crinus” has been published with the termination “-crinites” for a genus of species belonging to the group Pelmatozoa, that name is to be emended to bear the termination “-crinus”, and, on being so emended, is to rank for purposes of priority as from the date on which it was published with the termination “-crinites” and is to be attributed to the author by whom it was so published.

DOCUMENT 36/2

By **L. R. COX**, M.A., Sc.D., F.R.S. (*British Museum (Natural History) London*)

REQUEST FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF CERTAIN GENERIC NAMES WITH THE TERMINATIONS “-ITES”, “-YTES” AND “-ITHES” PUBLISHED BY EARLY AUTHORS FOR FOSSIL GENERA

Enclosure to a letter dated 14th March, 1949

This note is an application to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to issue a *Declaration* to the effect that “Where a fossil species has been described, figured, or referred to under a generic name based on the name of a genus previously established in binominal literature either for living or fossil species, that name being modified by the addition or substitution for its original termination of the termination ‘ites’, ‘ytes’ or ‘ithes’, sometimes preceded by a consonant, and there is no clear evidence that there was any intention that the name in question should designate a distinct generic group, the term so used is not to be accepted as a generic name and possesses no rights under the Law of Priority”.

The object of this application is the suppression of a series of names published in early binominal literature which, although hitherto ignored by the majority of workers, are not at present excluded from availability by any section of the International Rules, and which therefore constitute a threat to stability in nomenclature.

The practice of adding the suffix "*ites*" (Greek *ιτης*) to a name when referring to a fossil species originated with Aristotle and Pliny, and was continued by many authors of the 15th-18th centuries who discussed fossils, often without appreciating their true nature. Consequently, when Linnaeus and his successors established many older names as generic names in binominal literature there also existed in the old literature a number of derivative names terminating in "*ites*". With the adoption of binominal nomenclature one group of naturalists, including Linnaeus himself, referred many fossils to living genera, or, when founding new genera for fossils, did not consistently employ names ending in "*ites*". Other naturalists, however, even when adopting binominal nomenclature, continued to use the "*ites*" derivative names when dealing with fossil species and coined new "*ites*" names when none already existed. Lamarck (1801, *Système des Animaux sans Vertèbres*: vii) refers to this practice as "l'usage généralement établi parmi les Lithologistes et les Crystologistes, de terminer uniformément le nom de toutes les dépouilles des corps vivans qui sont dans l'état fossile, et dans ce cas de transformer le nom de *peigne* en *pectinite*, de *turbo* en *turbinite*, &c."

The terminations "*ithes*" and "*lithes*" (presumably derived from the Greek *λιθος*) occasionally take the place of "*ites*", and it is suggested the *Declaration* should apply also to derivative generic names with these endings. Occasionally "*ytes*" is used instead of "*ites*".

The attitude of modern palaeontologists to these names is shown by the following two quotations. F. A. Bather (1898, *Natural Science*, 12: 251) states, "The termination '*ites*' was generally applied to the organism when in a fossil state, but was not held to indicate generic distinction . . . It has never been maintained that the chance addition of this suffix constituted a difference of name, and all modern authors on Crinoidea have merely dropped it as out of harmony with modern views as to the nature of fossils". W. D. Lang, S. Smith and H. D. Thomas (*Index of Palaeozoic Coral Genera* (1940, *Brit. Mus. (Nat. Hist.)*: 14, 83, 86) reject the names *Acroporites*, *Madreporites* and *Milleporites* as "merely names indicating fossil forms of *Acropora*, *Madrepora* and *Millepora*".

It has been considered desirable to stipulate that the proposed *Declaration* should not apply to cases where there is clear evidence that the "*ites*" name referred to a different generic group from the living genus whose name it suggests. Thus *Brachyurites* Schlotheim (Crustacean genus) could not be suppressed as a derivative of *Brachyurus* Fischer (mammalian genus). There are also cases when the genus bearing the "*ites*" name belongs to the same family as the genus from whose name this was derived, but has a different generic diagnosis associated with it (e.g., Lamarck gave different diagnoses for *Nautilites* and *Nautilus*).

It is necessary that the *Declaration* should cover cases of the addition of the "*ites*" termination to generic names published only for fossil groups (e.g.,

Kruger's alteration of the names *Venericardia* and *Plagiostoma* to *Venericardites* and *Plagiostomatites*.

If the suggested *Declaration* is issued, there will still remain a number of early generic names with the termination "*ites*"⁽¹⁾ which have not been generally adopted, although they cannot be regarded as derivatives of names of living genera. Such names (e.g., *Brachyurites* Schlotheim, *Macrourites* Schlotheim) would be best suppressed by supplementary *Opinions*. Some early "*ites*" names which are not derivative names (e.g., *Hippurites*, *Radiolites*, *Tentaculites*) are in general use. The only "*ites*" derivative name which, to the writer's knowledge, was ever widely adopted was *Myacites* Schlotheim, a derivative of *Mya* Linnaeus. This name is not, however, used by modern authors. The proposed decision would, therefore, affect no generic names which are in general use at the present day.

Notes on Certain Authors Involved

Examination of names terminating in "*ites*" which are indexed as generic names by Sherborn and Neave shows that authors publishing them may be divided into three categories.

(a) Authors who should not be accepted as binominal and whose "*ites*" names should, therefore, be attributed to later authors who adopted them. Among such non-binominal authors are

Gesner, J., 1758. *Tractatus Physicus de Petrificatis*

Martini, F. H. W., 1767. "Nachricht von einigen seltenen Anomiten". *Berlin. Mag.*, iv, pp. 36-57.

Guettard, J. E., 1770. "Douzième Mémoire, qui renferme l'ordre, suivant lequel on a cru pouvoir arranger les Polypites". *Méme. diff. Part. Sci. Arts*, ii, pp. 312-444.

Martin, W., 1809. *Petrificats Derbiensia*. [Martin employs a peculiar trinominal nomenclature, his trivial names being binominal. Among the first components of his trivial names are several ending in "*ites*" which have been indexed as generic names by Sherborn and Neave. Martin's generic names all end in "*lithus*" and have never been adopted.]⁽²⁾

(b) Binominal author whose names terminating in "*ites*" cannot be accepted as generic names :—

Gmelin, J. F., 1793. *Systema Naturae* (Linné), ed. 13, vol. iii. [In the "Larvata" section of this volume are several names with the ter-

⁽¹⁾ And also the termination "*lithus*".

⁽²⁾ Compare J. B. Knight, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.*, 1, 1947, p. 260.

mination "*ites*" which appear on various pages in the left-hand column devoted to trivial names. This volume should in any case be suppressed*. The generic names all terminate in "*lithus*" and have been ignored by later workers.

(c) Authors to whom the Declaration would apply.

The chief authors who have come to notice are :—

Leske, N. G., 1778. New edit. of J. T. Klein, *Naturalis Dispositio Echinodermatum*. [The names affected are *Cidarites*, *Echinanthites*, *Echinites*, *Spatangites*.]

Blumenbach, J. F., 1803. Specimen *Archaeologiae Telluris*. [All new names except *Bitubulites* and *Oolithes* are affected.]

Lamarck, J. B. de, 1804. "Mémoires sur les fossiles des environs de Paris." *Ann. Mus.*, v. [Lamarck proposes certain new generic names (*Discorbis*, *Lenticulina*, etc.) and describes certain species under the "*ites*" derivative names *Discorbites*, *Lenticulites*, etc.].

Schlotheim, E. F. von, 1813. "Beitrag zur Naturgeschichte der Versteinerungen" *Taschenb. f. Min.* (Leonhard), vii, pp. 3–134. [Numerous "*ites*" names, all derivative names except one.]

Wahlenberg, G., 1819. "Petrificata Telluris Suecanae." *Nov. Act. R. Soc. Upsala*, viii. [All "*ites*" names except three, are derivative names.]

Schlotheim, E. F. von, 1820. *Die Petrefact-enkunde auf ihrem jetzigen Standpunkte*. [Numerous "*ites*" names, of which all but a few are derivative names; of these few, some have been adopted by later workers and some ignored.]

Krüger, J. F., 1823. *Geschichte der Urwelt*, ii. [Generic names terminating in "*ites*" or "*lithes*" are used throughout the fossil invertebrate part of this work, and the decision would affect all of those newly published.]

Salter, J. W., 1857. "On Annelide-Burrows from the Longmynd." *Quart. Journ. Geol. Soc.*, xiii, pp. 199–206. [Proposes a new name *Arenicolites* as an emendation of *Arenicola* "to make the name more symmetrical with other terms of general import."]

* A proposal to this end has already been submitted to the International Commission. See Winckworth, 1951 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 2: 38).

DOCUMENT 36/3

By J. WANNER (*Scheidegg/Algäu, Bavaria, Germany*)

“-CRINITES” OR “-CRINUS”?

Communicated by Dr. Henning Lemche under cover of a letter dated 3rd January, 1950.

During the first third of the last century specialists, when publishing new generic names for true Crinoidea, normally selected names ending in “-crinites”. (For example, *Pentacrinites* of Blumenbach, 1804; *Actinocrinites*, *Apiocrinites*, *Cyathocrinites*, *Eugeniocrinites*, *Platycrinites*, *Poteriocrinites*, *Rhodocrinites*, of Miller, 1821; *Caryocrinites* of Say, 1825; *Cupressocrinites*, *Eucalyptocrinites*, *Melocrinites* of Goldfusz, 1826; *Echinoencrinites* of von Meyer, 1826; *Scyphocrinites* of Zenker, 1833; and *Haplocrinites* of Steininger, 1834). In the year 1835 L. Agassiz (1835, *Mém. Soc. sci. nat. Neuchâtel* 1, 5: 168) proposed substituting for the ending “-crinites” the ending “-crinus,” which up till that time had appeared only once, namely in the case of the now no longer valid genus, *Ollacrinus* Cumberland, 1826. This proposal was received at once with general acclamation. Thus within a year J. Philipps (1836, *Ill. Geology of Yorkshire*, II, London) named the new Crinoid genera which he established in that work *Euryocrinus* and *Gilbertsocrinus*. In 1837 there appeared *Isocrinus* and *Chelocrinus* of von Meyer; in 1839, *Dichocrinus* and *Triacrinus* of von Münster; in 1840 *Otenocrinus* of Bronn; in 1842 *Stephanocrinus* and *Nucleocrinus* of Conrad; in 1843 *Marsupiocrinus* of Morris, *Pleurocrinus* of T. & T. Austin, and *Taxocrinus* of Philipps; in 1847, *Glyptocrinus* of Hall, and so on and so forth.

It is true that a certain number of specialists when establishing new genera still for a time adhered or reverted sometimes to the older form of ending “-crinites”. For example, *Dimerocrinites* of Philipps, 1839; *Cryptocrinites* of von Buch, 1840; *Heliocrinites* and *Protocrinites* of Eichwald, 1840; *Pseudocrinites* of Pearce, 1842; *Agelacrinites* of Vanuxem, 1842; *Crotalocrinites*, *Periechocrinites*, *Sagenocrinites* and *Sycocrinites* of T. & T. Austin, 1842; *Hexacrinites* of T. & T. Austin, 1843; *Bactocrinites* of Schnur, 1849 and *Zeacrinites* of Troost, 1849. At this point, however, the period during which new genera were published with the ending “-crinites” was finally closed. The older names such as *Poteriocrinites* etc. rapidly disappeared from the literature and were replaced by the later forms *Poteriocrinus* etc. The older forms still appeared from time to time in certain genera of Crinoidea, as for example Sandberger & Sandberger, 1856 (*Haplocrinites*), Meek & Worthen, 1866, 1869, 1873 (*Poteriocrinites*, *Actinocrinites*, *Cyathocrinites*), Carpenter, 1884 (*Glypto-*

crinites) and Reed, 1908 (*Bactrocrinites*). There are also a few isolated instances where generic names which had originally been published with the newer ending “-crinus” had been emended to the older form “-crinites”. Thus, for example, Geinitz, 1846, changed *Carpocrinus* Müller, 1840 into *Carpocrinites* and *Dichocrinus* Münster, 1839, into *Dichocrinites*, although on the other hand he changed *Pseudocrinites* Pearce, 1842, into *Pseudocrinus* (his position was thus not consistent); Chapman, 1857, changed *Callicrinus* d’Orbigny, 1849, into *Callicrinites* and Steininger, 1849 and 1853, changed *Ctenocrinus* Bronn, 1840 into *Ctenocrinites*. Apart from these exceptions, however, the practical proposal of Agassiz had been put into general application.

In this way names such as *Poteriocrinus* etc. had for a hundred years become deeply embedded in general textbooks and handbooks of geology and palaeontology when R. S. Bassler (1938, *Foss. Catal. I. Anim.*, pars 83.’s-Gravenhage) on the basis of a strict application of the *Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique*, reverted to the original forms of these names, which he used also in his Index of Palaeozoic Pelmatozoa (Bassler, R. S. & M. W. Moody, 1943, *Geol. Soc. America*, Spec. Pap. No. 45). We are concerned here with two works which fully deserve our respect and admiration, and which, on account of their completeness (insofar as this is attainable) and reliability, will for a long time to come constitute an indispensable tool for every worker in the field of Echinoderms. Moreover, it is not as though the re-introduction of the original forms of names affected only one or two genera. Bassler’s “rectification” affects not less than 25 palaeozoic genera, and a whole series of more recent genera including many which are widely distributed, containing a large number of species and are familiar to every geologist, such as *Poteriocrinus*, *Cyathocrinus*, *Apiocrinus*, the genus *Pentacrinus*, well-known to every zoologist, and in addition, as we shall see, carries with it such far-reaching consequences that one cannot help asking whether Bassler’s action was necessary or useful.

The fact that Bassler is formally in the right cannot of course be disputed. Article 19 of the *Règles* states: “L’orthographe originelle d’un nom doit être conservée, à moins qu’il ne soit évident que ce nom renferme une faute de transcription, d’orthographe ou d’impression.”

We are however of the opinion that in the present case the restoration of the original form of these names is not absolutely necessary, and sincerely regret that in this matter we are not able to agree with our honoured friend Dr. Bassler. We set out below the reasons for our disagreement:

(1) The *Règles* themselves, like all human laws, are imperfect, since their authors were not able to foresee all the unintended consequences to which their application might in certain cases give rise.

(2) The action of Agassiz and others in changing the ending of certain generic names from “-crinites” to “-crinus” has never given rise to any

misunderstanding. No one has ever had the slightest doubt that *Poteriocrinus*, *Cupressocrinus*, *Melocrinus*, etc. had exactly the same meaning as *Poteriocrinites*, *Cupressocrinities*, *Melocrinites*, etc. Nor have any of the innumerable authors who, subsequent to the introduction of the *Règles*, have adopted the later forms for these names, thereby continually offending against Article 19 of the *Règles*, regarded the offence as sufficiently grave as seriously to regard these forms as invalid. Even Dr. F. A. Bather, in his time the greatest authority in the field of fossil Echinoderms and himself a member of the International Commission of Zoological Nomenclature, never thought of adhering to the *Règles* in this matter. On the contrary, he was one of the most active supporters of the simplified form of these names, and went even further: "I do not plead", he said (1926, *The Naturalist*, No. 30: 81), "for a strict adherence to the International Rules of Nomenclature in every occasional publication. Though a member of the International Commission, I am no priority fan."

(3) The restoration of the original forms of these names is, in our view, inexpedient, since it would have the following undesirable consequences:

(a) In the case of all species which were published after the introduction of the revised formats of the generic names, the names of the authors would have to be placed in brackets: thus we should have to write, for example, *Cupressocrinites hieroglyphicus* (Schultze) instead of, as hitherto, *Cupressocrinus hieroglyphicus* Schultze. According to Bassler & Moodey (1943), for example, the genus *Platycrinus* contains some 157 valid species; if these species were now to be referred to *Platycrinites*, it would be necessary to place brackets round the names of the authors in not less than 143 cases. In the case of *Cyathocrinus* brackets would be needed in 84 cases out of 93; for *Melocrinus*, 63 out of 76; and for *Eucalyptocrinus*, 43 out of 47; and so on. Moreover, hitherto, whenever we have seen an author's name in brackets, we knew that when the species in question was first published it had been placed by its author in another genus. If now we were to follow the procedure of Bassler, we should henceforth never know for sure for what reason an author's name had been placed in brackets: the brackets might still have the same significance as before, but could equally well signify that the author in question had originally placed the species in the same genus as that to which it was currently referred, but that he had not employed the original ending for the generic name. Thus in the case of *Hexacrinites brevis* (Goldfusz), for example, the author's name has to be placed in brackets because Goldfusz described his species originally as *Platycrinites brevis*; in the case of *Hexacrinites nodifer* (Schultze) on the other hand, the author's name is bracketed because he originally described the species as *Hexacrinus nodifer*. In the case of 36 species of *Hexacrinus* which are recognised today, the bracketing of the author's name would have the latter of these meanings, and in the case of 13 species the former.

(b) The restoration of the original forms for these generic names would lead to corresponding changes in certain family names. We should have to write *Platycrinitidae* instead of *Platycrinidae*, *Hexacrinitidae* instead of *Hexacrinidae*, *Melocrinitidae*, *Cupressocrinitidae*, *Poteriocrinitidae* etc. But that would be only the relatively harmless beginning of a further complication. It is usual to attribute family names to their authors. The name-forms *Platycrinitidae* etc. originate from Bassler. Thus we now see R. C. Moore & F. B. Plummer (1938, *Denison Univ. Bull. J. Sci. Lab.* 32 : 236, Dec. 1937, publ. Feb. 1938) referring to the family *Poteriocrinitidae* Bassler, 1938 ; and R. C. Moore (*Denison Univ. Bull. J. Sci. Lab.* 34 : 198) referring again to the family *Poteriocrinitidae* Bassler, 1942 ; and W. E. Schmidt (*Abh. Reichstelle Bodenforschung* N. F. Heft 182, Berlin, 1941, publ. 29.3.1942) writing of the family *Platycrinitidae* Bassler, the family *Hexacrinitidae* Bassler, etc. The original founders of these families were, however, quite other persons. It is thus not only misleading but also contrary to historical justice to make no reference to the original author of a family, but to attribute the name to someone who has done no more than to transform a family name which originally ended in “-crinidae” into an exactly similar name, but ending in “-crinitidae”. Thus, in just recognition of this situation, Moore (*Denison Univ. Bull. J. Sci. Lab.* 35) referred already in 1940 to the family *Poteriocrinitidae* Roemer, and added in a footnote (: 35) “Earlier papers (Moore & Plummer, 1938 : 236 ; Moore, 1939 : 198) that list this family in the name of Bassler are believed to have been incorrect in transferring designation of authorship from Roemer to Bassler since it was Roemer who formulated the concept of this family on the basis of a type genus, *Poteriocrinites* Miller, which he improperly followed authors in calling *Poteriocrinus*. Bassler merely emended this spelling to make it conform to the correct designation of the type genus.” Accordingly we find also in Moore & Plummer (1940, *The Univ. of Texas*, Publ. No. 3945) : *Dimerocrinitidae* Bather, *Rhodocrinitidae* Roemer, *Melocrinitidae* Zittel, *Poteriocrinitidae* Roemer, etc., although later on, in Moore & Laudon (1943, *Geol. Soc. America*, Spec. Pap. No. 46), we are surprised to find once again *Poteriocrinitidae* Bassler, *Cyathocrinitidae* Bassler etc. Bassler himself tries to do justice not only to himself but to the original author also when he writes : (Bassler & Moodey, 1943) Family *Poteriocrinitidae* Bassler (*Poteriocrinidae* Roemer) etc. This method of citation may be shortened in accordance with the procedure of Regnéll (1945) to Fam. *Poteriocrinitidae* (Roemer) Bassler, but nevertheless the necessity of citing two authors to one family name remains an unwelcome burden, which would arise in the case of 16 families in the Class *Crinoidea*, especially since in certain circumstances it might well appear necessary to add also the name of the author of the latest taxonomic revision of the family itself.

(4) In former systems of classification the ending “-crinitidae” has sometimes been used for higher systematic units, e.g., Wachsmuth & Springer (1879–1886, *Rev. of the Palaeocriniidea*, P. I–III. Philadelphia,

and 1897, *North American Crinoidea Camerata*) used *Actinocrinites Hexacrinites*, *Melocrinites*, *Periechocrinites*, *Platycrinites*, as Section names in the sense of subfamilies, and Jaekel (1918, *Pal. Zeitschr.* 3. Berlin) used *Cyathocrinites* and *Poteriocrinites* in the sense of sub-Orders of the Order *Fistulata*.

(5) The forms such as *Poteriocrinus*, etc. have been accepted for more than 100 years.

The fact that the forms ending in “-crinus” and “-crinidae” are shorter and simpler than those ending in “-crinites” and “-crinitidae” may be noted incidentally, since this cannot be regarded as a decisive point, though it is perhaps not entirely without weight.

The reception which Bassler's proposal has found in recent literature is divided, as might have been foreseen, but this is of no great significance, since, as Moore, Weller Knight (1942, *J. Palaeontology*, 16: 250—261) very rightly remark, there will always in such cases be some authors who are “agnostics”, in the sense that they have no independent views of their own, but merely follow other authors. Moore, Moore & Plummer, Moore & Laudon, as has already been indicated, have followed Bassler in using the ending “-crinites” and “-crinitidae”, as have also W. Goldring, G. Regnéll, G. Ubaghs, J. Wright. On the other hand E. Kirk, de Marez-Oyens, G. Delpy, H. Sieverts-Doreck, J. Wanner, and N. N. Yakovlev have stuck firmly to the forms “-crinus” and “-crinidae”. A statistical analysis of this kind would only have any sense if all the authors concerned were fully conversant with the basic arguments on both sides of this disputed question. We are convinced that in this case the majority would be in favour of retaining the ending “-crinus”. The reception of Th. Mortensen's action for the retention of *Encrinus*, *Archaeocidaris* and other Echinoderm names (1932, *Ann. & Mag. Nat. Hist.* 10: 345—368) has shown clearly that nearly all workers are prepared to support well-founded proposals, even when they are not in accordance with the strict letter of the *Règles*.

We should like, therefore, to lay the following question before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:

Would it be better, (a) in the case of all *Pelmatozoa* names which were originally published with the ending “-crinites” to retain this name-form, or, would it be better, (b) in the case of all *Pelmatozoa* generic names which were originally formed with the ending “-crinites” to emend them, under the plenary powers, so that the corresponding names with the ending “-crinus” instead of “-crinites” would then become the valid names. The original author's name could then be appended to each of these generic names as though he had himself used the emended spelling.

Personally, we are of the opinion that the problem could best be solved by the adoption of the second of these two courses.

DOCUMENT 36/4

By the late **TH. MORTENSEN**

(Universitetets Zoologisk Museum, Copenhagen)

Note dated 2nd January, 1950.

I am in full agreement with Professor Wanner as to the desirability of reaching uniformity in the nomenclature of Crinoids. I wish urgently to recommend that the termination "-crinus" and "-CRINIDAE" be made obligatory.

DOCUMENT 36/5

By **TORSTEN GISLÉN**

(Lunds Universitets Zoologiska Institution, Lund, Sweden)

Professor J. Wanner, one of the most prominent scientists in Echinoderm palaeontology of today, has made a proposal to use the termination "-crinus" instead of "-crinites". Though in many cases this will be in opposition to the strict application of the nomenclatorial Rules, it seems to me that he has brought forward the argument in support of his proposition in such a convincing way that I gladly recommend his proposal.

DOCUMENT 36/6

By **RAYMOND C. MOORE**

(University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.)

Extract from a letter dated 2nd June, 1950.

A few days ago, I received from Dr. Prof. J. Wanner a statement entitled “-crinites oder -crinus”, in which is raised a far-reaching question of nomenclature as applied to fossil crinoids. It is my understanding that with endorsement of Professor T. Gislén of Sweden and Dr. T. Mortensen of Denmark, this communication has been transmitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature with recommendation and request to the Commission that “all generic names of pelmatozoans which originally were published with the termination -crinites shall by suspension of the rules be altered to an ending in -crinus.” Perhaps I am mistaken in thinking that this matter has formally been laid before the Commission.

I quite understand and am sympathetic to objectives of Dr. Wanner, but for several reasons I think that it would be very undesirable to take the sweeping sort of action suggested by him. It is my own view and I think that I can speak for several other specialists in study of crinoids that either (a) no suspension of the rules should be invoked or that (b) suspension of the rules should be in form of action on a specific list of generic terms for validation and entry on the *Official List of Generic Names*. I should not be opposed to the latter form of action provided there is reasonable assurance that the Commission might effectuate this suspension within not more than a year's time. My reason for this is that within the year we expect to have manuscript for the crinoid section of the TREATISE ON INVERTEBRATE PALEONTOLOGY ready for press and whatever is published here certainly will tend to fix nomenclatural procedure affecting these organisms.

I agree strongly with Dr. Karl P. Schmidt in expression published in *Science*, March 3, 1950, along with your own discussion of zoological nomenclature in judging that a much larger use of the *Official List* by the Commission will tend to remove many nomenclatural difficulties. I strongly disagree with some views expressed by the Smithsonian discussion group; and most of all, I think that it will greatly help nomenclatural aspects of zoological science if ambiguities of the *Règles* can be removed as in the new draft, and if the sterile hunt for priorities which upset long established terms can largely be circumvented through actions of the Commission in use of its *Official List*.

CASE NO. 37

ARTICLE 25, PROVISIO (a) : PROPOSED INSERTION OF WORDS TO MAKE IT CLEAR THAT A TRIVIAL NAME HAVING AS ITS INDICATION ONLY A QUALIFIED REFERENCE TO A PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED TRIVIAL NAME DOES NOT SATISFY THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE FOREGOING PROVISIO.

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)349)

DOCUMENT 37/1

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

REPORT ON THE ADOPTION BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE ON THE ADOPTION OF A " DECLARATION " ON THE QUESTION OF THE AVAILABILITY OF A TRIVIAL NAME HAVING AS ITS INDICATION ONLY A QUALIFIED REFERENCE TO A PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED TRIVIAL NAME

The question whether a qualified reference to a previously published trivial name unaccompanied by any other particulars constitutes for a trivial name an " indication " for the purposes of Proviso (a) to Article 25 was raised first in an application submitted by Dr. Angua M. Woodbury and Dr. Hobart M. Smith (*University of Illinois, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*) on the question of the name to be accepted as the oldest available name for the race of the yellow rattlesnakes of the Colorado River Basin. As the issue so raised involved a question of principle, it fell, under the procedure prescribed in 1948, to be dealt with not by an *Opinion* but by an interpretative *Declaration*. In agreement with the authors referred to above, such a *Declaration* was asked for in a note by the Secretary published in September 1951 (Hemming, 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 103-105).

2. Terms of the "Declaration" voted upon by the International Commission : The following is the text of the proposed *Declaration* on which the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature voted by post in 1952 :—

A trivial name published without descriptive matter of any kind, except a qualified (*i.e.* doubtful or provisional) synonymic reference to an older trivial name that had been validly published with an indication, definition or description is to be treated as having been published without an "indication" for the purposes of Proviso (*a*) to Article 25. A trivial name so published is to be treated as a *nomen nudum* possessing no status in zoological nomenclature.

3. Adoption on 22nd August, 1952 of a "Declaration" banning as having published without an "indication" any trivial name which, when first published was accompanied only by a qualified synonymic reference to a previously published such name : The International Commission adopted on 22nd August, 1952 a *Declaration* on the foregoing subject in the terms of the draft set out in paragraph 2 above. Of the eighteen members of the International Commission there voted in favour of the proposed *Declaration* the following seventeen Commissioners (arranged in the order in which votes were received) : W. T. Calman ; E. M. Hering ; J. R. Dymond ; B. Hankó ; P. Bonnet ; H. E. Vokes ; J. C. Bradley ; A. do Amaral ; F. Hemming ; T. Esaki ; N. D. Riley ; H. Lemche ; R. Mertens ; J. Pearson ; N. R. Stoll ; H. Boschma ; A. Cabrera. No Commissioner voted against the proposed *Declaration*. No vote was received from T. Jaczewski.

4. Submission of "Declaration" by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology : Under the procedure governing the rendering by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of *Declarations* interpreting the *Règles* an interpretation so given becomes operative immediately, but it is the duty of the International Commission to submit a *Declaration* so adopted to the next International Congress of Zoology for final approval. In accordance with the foregoing procedure, the *Declaration* set out in paragraph 2 of the present note adopted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by 17 votes (one Commissioner not voting) is hereby submitted to the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology for final approval.

CASE NO. 38

ARTICLE 28 : PROPOSED RESTORATION, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, OF
THE FIRST REVISER PRINCIPLE

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)682)

DOCUMENT 38/1

Introductory Note by FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

The annexed papers are all concerned to secure the complete or partial revocation of the decision taken at Paris in 1948 by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology (on the advice of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature) to substitute in Article 28 the principle of page, line and word precedence for the principle of the First Reviser (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 257-258, 328-331).

2. Although the general object of the proposals now submitted is similar, the actual proposals brought forward differ from one another in certain respects. It may, therefore, be convenient to provide the following summary of the recommendations received :—

(1) Complete return to the First Reviser principle :

This is advocated by (1) the Committee on Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum (Document 38/2), (2) Professor Rudolf Richter (Document 38/4) and Dr. Henning Lemche (Document 38/5).

(2) Return to the First Reviser Principle, a *Recommendation* to be added urging First Revisers in future to "follow the principle of page precedence except where good reason is stated for doing otherwise" :

This is the course recommended by the Nomenclature Discussion Group, Washington, D.C. (Document 38/3).

(3) Return to the First Reviser principle in respect of the period ending 31st December, 1953, and, as from 1st January, 1954, the adoption of page precedence "in all cases in which a First Reviser has not acted before 1st January, 1954" :

This is the course recommended by the Society of Systematic Zoology (Document 38/6).

3. Need for a definition of the action constituting action by a First Reviser :

The return, as proposed, to the First Reviser principle will make it necessary once again to consider the problem of what constitutes the selection of one of two or more contending names of equal date by a First Reviser. The problem here is similar to that involved in determining whether a given author has or has not effectively selected a given nominal species under Rule (g) in Article 30 to the type species of a genus established without a designated or indicated type species. The difficulty here is substantial, for, although the foregoing Rule provides that the expression "select a 'type species'" is to be "rigidly construed", specialists have found it necessary to obtain rulings upon a number of situations where it was doubtful—or at least was open to argument—whether Rule (g) had been duly complied with by a given author. It was, no doubt, the lack of a definition as to what constitutes a selection by a First Reviser which in the past has led in some groups to inconsistencies in the application of Article 28 and indeed to the disregard of its provisions. The following suggested provision is put forward as a basis for the discussion of this important question :

Draft of a definition of the action required to be taken by an author to constitute a selection by a "First Reviser" under Article 28.

The expression "selection by a First Reviser" is to be rigidly construed, and such a selection is to be deemed to have been effected only when an author, after citing names published in the same book and on the same date for two or more nominal species (or subspecies), clearly indicates by whatever method, (a) that he is of the opinion that those nominal species (or subspecies) represent the same taxonomic unit, and (b) that he is selecting one of the names concerned, to the exclusion of the other names, to be the name to be used for that taxonomic unit.

4. Need for a saving clause to protect from disturbance well-established names already brought into use in accordance with the principle of page precedence : In its present application the Nomenclature Discussion Group, Washington, based their objection, in part, to the 1948 decision to substitute the page precedence principle for that of the first reviser on the ground that this necessarily led to name-changing of a kind calculated to give rise to instability and confusion (Document 38/3). It is a fact that any change in the *Règles* and, in most cases, any clarification of existing provisions is liable to lead to difficulties of this kind. In the present instance an attempt was made at Paris to ward off this danger by the adoption of a provision (i) that, where the adoption of the provision then agreed upon (i.e. the adoption of the page precedence principle) would lead to a change in the name of a taxonomic unit of importance, specialists might apply to the International Commission for the use of its plenary powers to maintain existing nomenclatorial practice, (ii) that, on such an application being submitted, no change in that practice

was to be made by any author until the Commission made known its decision on the application submitted to it, and (iii) that it should be the duty of the Commission to give sympathetic consideration to applications of the foregoing type, when submitted to it (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 330, Point (2) (a) and (b)). It is suggested that, on the repeal of the Paris decision on the question of page precedence, a safeguard at least as effective as that embodied in the decision in favour of the principle now proposed to be reversed will be needed if extensive and objectionable name-changing is to be avoided.

DOCUMENT 38/2

**By the COMMITTEE ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE CHICAGO NATURAL
HISTORY MUSEUM**

Extract from a letter dated 15th May, 1952.

The Committee on Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum proposes modifications of and additions to the Rules of Zoological Nomenclature as below stated. These proposals * are submitted to the International Commission more than one year in advance of the International Zoological Congress at Copenhagen with the request that they be put to a vote at the Section of Nomenclature of said Congress.

Proposal 1

We propose that, if two names for the same taxonomic unit are proposed in the same publication, such names are to be considered as of equal priority. The name selected by the first reviser shall become the valid name.

Reasons : This rule was part of the Rules of Nomenclature from 1901 to 1948. It has often permitted the first reviser to select the better known of two names, even though it might have been published on a later line or page. The retroactive change of this rule at Paris (1948) seriously threatens the stability of nomenclature and should be rejected categorically.

Since the first reviser has the privilege of selecting the name that has page or line priority, names stabilised on the basis of such selection are in no case threatened by the first reviser rule, while the reciprocal is *not* true.

KARL P. SCHMIDT
Dr. FRITZ HAAS
LOREN P. WOODS
ROBERT F. INGER
A. L. RAND (mostly reservations about
the form of Proposal 3)
EMMET R. BLAKE
RUPERT L. WENZEL
COLIN CAMPBELL SANBORN
CLIFFORD H. POPE
D. DWIGHT DAVIS

* The other proposals submitted in this letter are being published at the appropriate points in the present volume.

DOCUMENT 38/3

By the **NOMENCLATURE DISCUSSION GROUP, WASHINGTON, D.C.**

Letter dated 16th July, 1952, from Dr. R. E. BLACKWELDER, *Secretary*

In response to your request for consideration of certain proposals to be presented to the Copenhagen Congress, we have prepared reports on several of them.

Two copies of each report* are enclosed herewith.

Annexe to Dr. Blackwelder's letter

Proposed Amendment to Restore the Rule of the First Reviser

The Nomenclature Discussion Group of Washington is convinced that in the past the International Code's rule of the first reviser has been faithfully followed by a large majority of zoologists, that a great many decisions have been made in good faith on that basis, and that a retroactive change in that rule has added to confusion and instability.

The Group is further convinced that even for the future, individual zoologists should be able to avoid confusion or disturbing changes by selecting a name published on a later page or line when there is good reason for so doing.

The Group therefore proposes to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the forthcoming International Congress of Zoology that the relevant action of the Paris Congress be reversed, and that the rule of the first reviser be restored to its pre-eminent position, as in the old Code, but with a recommendation that in the future, the first reviser shall follow the principle of page precedence except where good reason is stated for doing otherwise.

* The other Reports here referred to are being published elsewhere in the Copenhagen Series of documents. (intl'd) F.H. 29th May, 1953

DOCUMENT 38/4

By **RUDOLF RICHTER**

(*Natur-Museum und Forschungs-Institut, Senckenberg, Frankfurt a.M., Germany*)

Statement received on 18th July, 1952

(ED. NOTE : The following statement, prior to its submission to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, had been published under the title "Seiten-Priorität ist keine Priorität" in June 1952 in the serial publication *Senckenbergiana* (33 (1/3) : 73-74).)

Auch das Prioritäts-Prinzip ist im Anfang missverstanden und übertrieben worden. Erst durch Schaden hat man den Weg zu einer stabilen und vernünftigen Nomenklatur zu suchen gelernt. Seit der Ermöglichung der Suspension der Regeln (1913) hat sich die Entwicklung der IRZN und der Internationalen Kommission auf diesem Wege bewegt. Wenn man sich auch, damals wie heute, allzu zeitraubend mit der Historie einzelner Namen aufgehalten hat, anstatt die Masse des wichtigen Tier-Namen mit grozen Würfeln endgültig festzulegen, so ist es doch, bei allen Stockungen und Schwankungen, nicht rückwärts gegangen.

Neuerdings aber, so unerwartet und enttäuschend das für alle sein muss, die der Nomenklatur nur den Wert eines Werkzeugs zubilligen, drohen Rückschritte zu längst überwundenen Standpunkten, bis in die Anfänge zurück.

Incredibile dictu : Die seit Einführung der Internationalen Regeln glücklich begrabene "*Seiten-Priorität*", ja sogar die "*Zeilen-Priorität*" soll wieder *exhumiert* werden ! Also die sklavische "*Priorität*" innerhalb derselben Veröffentlichung. Der Revisor, der aus wissenschaftlichen Gründen mehrere Arten oder Gattungen zusammenlegt, soll gezwungen werden, immer denjenigen Namen zu wählen, der in der betreffenden Veröffentlichung an erster Stelle erwähnt wird. Auch dann, wenn in der nächsten Zeile oder auf einer späteren Seite eine Name zur Verfügung steht, der eindeutiger typisiert, morphologisch besser begründet, geographisch oder stratigraphisch genauer erfassbar ist.

Muss die Vernunft, die in der Priorität liegen kann, derart zu Unsinn werden? Leider haben auch einige hoch-verdiente Zoologen und Paläontologen sich bereits irreführen lassen, indem sie glaubten, sie seien tatsächlich seit 1948 zu Sklaven einer so sinnlosen und unlogischen "Priorität" geworden. Sie fühlen sich gezwungen, den "zeilen-älteren" Namen auch dann wählen zu müssen, wenn dieser Name mit Nachteilen, ja vielleicht mit unheilbarer Unsicherheit belastet ist und der Nomenklatur dauernde Schwierigkeiten bringen wird. Diese Revisoren und alle Autoren werden befreit aufatmen, wenn sie erkennen, dass ein solcher Zwang von Rechts wegen gar nicht besteht.

Im Gegensatz hierzu hat die Internationale Nomenklatur-Kommission bis 1948 immer energisch den Standpunkt vertreten, dass in einer Veröffentlichung *sämtliche Seiten und Zeilen als gleichzeitig veröffentlicht* anzusehen sind. Das Datum ist für alle Seiten dasselbe, von der ersten bis zur letzten.

Diese *innere Gleichzeitigkeit jeder Veröffentlichung* ist, wie gesagt, *notwendig für die Freiheit des Revisors* und damit für die Stabilität und Vernunft der Nomenklatur. Von solcher Freiheit hängt daher schliesslich auch die Sicherheit der Taxonomie ab, die Grundlage aller zoologischen Teilwissenschaften.

Die innere Gleichzeitigkeit ist aber auch *für die Freiheit des Autors nötig*, nämlich um den Autor vor Auslegungen *gegen* seine *intentio* zu schützen. Der Autor muss, wie bisher, die Freiheit behalten, *der letzten Seite* seiner Veröffentlichung *derseblen Wert* beizumessen wie der ersten. Er darf verlangen, dass der Leser dasselbe tut. Nicht nur deswegen, weil wir Autoren oft ein weiter hinten gedrucktes Kapitel früher schreiben als ein davor gedrucktes, oder gar die Einleitung zuletzt. Sondern vor allem deswegen, weil wir Autoren manchmal das weniger Wichtige und weniger Sichere *absichtlich* zuerst bringen und das besser Gesicherte danach. *Die Reihenfolge im Druck ist oft nur eine Sache der technischen Zweckmässigkeit und kann eine andere*, wenn nicht sogar die umgekehrte, sein als die *Reihenfolge der Sicherheit*.

Nicht genug mit der Fesselung von Gegenwart und Zukunft: Sogar für die Vergangenheit *rückwirkend* soll die neue "priority" nach "precedence in pages, lines and position in lines . . . be applied to all publications of post-Linnaean date"! Nur wenn dadurch ein Name "of importance" gefährdet wird, "specialists may apply to the Commission", um für ihn einen ausnahmsweisen Schutz in einem umständlichen Einzel-Verfahren zu erkämpfen. Alle normalen Namen, die gegen die neue "Priorität" verstossen, seien zu ändern, auch wenn sie seit 1758 unangefochten bestehen. *Neues Freiwild, schutzlos gemacht—durch die zu Schutz und Stabilisierung verpflichteten Hüter!*—Die Nomenklaturisten werden das Signal zur Jagd nur zu gut verstehen.

Gegen die Pariser Beschlüsse von 1948 ist von vielen Institutionen, zumal in Amerika Protest eingelegt worden, —sowohl wegen der Schädlichkeit wie wegen der rechtlichen Ungültigkeit. Für die Zoologen derjenigen Länder, die zu dem Kongress nicht eingeladen oder zugelassen waren und die daher an den Beratungen und Beschlüssen nicht mitwirken durften, ist die Ungültigkeit noch eindeutiger.

Die Beschlüsse haben also *keine internationale Gültigkeit*. Erst der Kongress in Kopenhagen 1953 wird bindende Beschlüsse fassen können. Es ist also noch Zeit, allerdings die höchste Zeit, die vorbereiteten Fesseln zurückzuweisen.

Die Deutsche Zoologische Gesellschaft und die Paläontologische Gesellschaft, haben eine gemeinsame Kommission für die erforderlichen Schritte eingesetzt.

While preparing this paper, I received our committee's report of the vote on its second ballot. My copy of that report showed the following returns on proposition VI:

"VI: Formerly, if an animal was named two or more times in the same book or paper, the first subsequent writer (the first reviser) selected one of the names, which was thenceforth used. At Paris a retro-active decision was made giving the first name priority (even if it appeared in the same line of print), thus making 'page priority' binding.

"1. I prefer to accept page priority as always binding, both past and future, except in cases sufficiently important to warrant suspension of the rules.

[79 votes]

"2. I prefer to accept page priority from January 1, 1954, onward, but in order to avoid changes in already well established names, I would follow the first reviser for all cases in which such a reviser has acted before January 1, 1954.

[104 votes]

"3. I prefer to follow the rule of the first reviser for the future as well as to the past. (A strong recommendation could be added here, to the effect that a first reviser should follow page priority unless there are good reasons for doing otherwise.)"

[136 votes]

Regarding this as a vote of 183 in favour of the application of page priority in one manner or another—as against a vote of 136 in favour of the application of the rule of the first reviser, I referred to it in my paper as a 57 per cent. majority in favour of the application of page priority from January 1, 1954, onward (including those who chose to accept page priority as *always* binding).

In the belief that the mandate of our society had been clearly expressed, I thereupon undertook to state all the objections that I could find to Mr. Hemming's proposed return to the rule of the first reviser (see enclosed copy of MS., page 8).

I have now received from Dr. Michener the proposed report to Mr. Hemming on this vote, and I am greatly perturbed to find that, contrary to what had seemed obvious to me, the vote has been interpreted by our committee as a mandate in favour of return to the rule of the first reviser.

I am convinced that this must have been done by inadvertence, but lest I may have overlooked some element of the situation, I urge that you write me your views at once. Please express yourselves freely—there is no need for diplomacy on this occasion.

APPENDIX 2 TO MR. FOLLETT'S LETTER OF 27TH JULY 1952

Comments by members of the Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology on the questions raised in the Memorandum of 4th July, 1952 (reproduced in Appendix 1)

Enclosure 1 to Appendix 2 to Mr. Follett's letter

Letter, dated 8th July, 1952, from L. M. KLAUBER (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*)

I have read with interest the various items recently forwarded to me. I believe that the only one requiring comment is your letter of July 4th, addressed to the members of your committee, and in particular the last paragraph.

It seems to me that your view of the vote in adding the votes for items 1 and 2 together as being 183 votes in favour of page priority is the correct view to take, at least as far as the future is concerned. If it were not too cumbersome a procedure, an additional canvass might be made requesting a choice between items 2 and 3, item 1 being eliminated. In other words, a decision as to whether page priority would be accepted for the future and the first reviser for the past, or the first reviser for the future as well as the past.

Enclosure 2 to Appendix 2 to Mr. Follett's letter

Extract from a letter, dated 15th July, 1952, from **ROBERT R. MILLER** (*University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.*)

First of all, I think you are absolutely correct in concluding that the vote on the recent SSZ ballot can only be interpreted as a vote in favour of the application of page priority in one way or another. Reeve agrees with you also. It would be interesting to see the actual breakdown by systematic disciplines of this vote. I wonder if most of those who favour the first reviser rule are not entomologists?

Enclosure 3 to Appendix 2 to Mr. Follett's letter

Extract from a letter, dated 8th July, 1952, from

CURTIS W. SABROSKY

(*United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Entomology & Plant Quarantine, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

With reference to your several enclosures, I believe that the ballot on page priority could be interpreted both ways in part: Page priority was

2. 104 (page precedence after January 1, 1954).

3. 136 (first reviser)

The Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology recommends that the decision with regard to page precedence reached at the Paris (1948) meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature be reversed, and that instead the rule of the first reviser be written into the *Règles* with the strong recommendation that a first reviser should follow page precedence unless there is good reason for doing otherwise.

CHARLES D. MICHENER,

*Chairman, Nomenclature Committee
Society of Systematic Zoology*

CONTENTS

(continued from front wrapper)

Copenhagen Discussions : Cases 34-38

	Page
Case No. 34 : Article 25 : proposed insertion of a provision that a trivial name consisting of spelled-out letters or numerals shall not be accepted as available when those letters or numerals were originally employed as ordinals for the enumeration of the species, subspecies or infra-subspecific names concerned	355
Case No. 35 : Article 25 : proposed insertion of a provision denying the status of availability to a trivial name inadvertently published as the result of the misreading of a previous publication or of a museum label or the like	357
Case No. 36 : Article 25 : proposed insertion of a provision that certain classes of generic names published for fossil species and bearing the termination "-ites", "-ytes" or "-ythes" possess no status in zoological nomenclature	360
Case No. 37 : Article 25, Proviso (a) : proposed insertion of a provision that a trivial name having as its indication only a qualified reference to a previously published trivial name does not satisfy the requirements of the foregoing proviso	374
Case No. 38 : Article 38 : proposed restoration, in whole or in part, of the first reviser principle	376